FOR SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION
DECLASSIFIED

April 16, 1952.

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

Participants

Secretary Acheson
Under Secretary Bruce
Foreign Minister of Canada, Mr. Pearson
Canadian Ambassador, Mr. Wrong

Last Saturday night, April 12, Mr. and Mrs. Pearson, Ambassador and Mrs. Wrong, and the Under Secretary and Mrs. Bruce dined with us in Maryland. After dinner, in my study, four matters of business were touched on, as follows:

1. Registration of Base Rights Agreements with the United Nations; under Article 102 of the Charter.

I mentioned this and discussed it briefly with Mr. Pearson. He thought that the State Department had somewhat changed its position on this matter. This I conceded to be the case. He was not prepared to agree as a matter of broad principle that anything having to do with these questions need not be registered because of Article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty. He was inclined to believe that new long-term lease arrangements might have to be, but he believed that the best way to approach this was on a case by case basis and to try to deal with most things through the procedure of the Joint Board on Defense.

This led him to bring up the second point.

2. Availability of Land in Canada for USAF Worldwide Communications Network.

He mentioned the difficulty which the position of the Air Force made for the Canadian Government. This came, he said, from the idea that the Canadian Government was increasingly being tied up with long-term arrangements which gave the United States operating rights in Canada. He thought that the purposes of both Governments could be achieved without creating this unnecessary political difficulty. To this political difficulty, he added the

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY CEC DATE 7-1-81
PDS☐or XDS☐EXT. DATE
E.O. AUTH. _____ SEC. 3(5)(C)
REDACTED EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED☑ RELEASABLE☑
RELEASE DENIED☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS _____

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED TOP SECRET

SECURITY INFORMATION

problem of registration.

I pointed out the difficulty of getting the necessary funds for these installations if our right to use them might be terminated even before they were completed.

He recognized this problem. He stressed the desire of the Canadian Government to cooperate with us and thought that we could place more reliance upon this continuing desire, which, in any event, was the basis of the arrangements. He suggested handling the matter by having the Canadian Government make the land available to us on the basis that neither party should question the continuing need for our operation for five years and that thereafter the Canadian formula of one year's notice, valuation and repayment, this right to be exercised by either party, should prevail.

I said that we would re-examine the question to see whether this helped us with our problem. I mentioned this conversation this morning to Ambassador Woodward, who thought this was a step forward and that, if we could add to it, the right of consultation through the Joint Board, something might be worked out.

3. The Gut Dam and the High Water Level on Lake Ontario.

I pointed out the political difficulties which the damage being done to lake shore property on the US side was raising. Mr. Pearson said that our own engineers believed that if the Gut Dam were totally removed, it would take three years to reduce the water level eight inches. I said that this might be true, but what we needed now was to get the matter before the Joint Commission.

Mr. Pearson said that their concern was that they did not wish the consideration of this question to delay consideration of an application for the St. Lawrence Power Project, which might be the case. He was willing to cooperate with us in getting the Gut Dam matter before the International Commission if we could work out some way of assuring that it would not delay consideration of the St. Lawrence project.

I said that I thought that this could be done, and it was decided that we should try to work it out on this basis.

DECLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY [illegible] DATE CEC 7-1-81
FDC [ ] or XDC [ ] EXT. [ ]
TS AUTH. [ ] E.A.O.(s) [ ]
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS [ ]
DECLASSIFIED/RELEASABLE [✓]
RELEASE DENIED [ ]
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS [ ]

DECLASSIFIED TOP SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION

4. General Eisenhower's Successor

Mr. Pearson mentioned the matter of General Eisenhower's successor. He thought that there was no question that the Council would wish an U.S. officer. He said that the only officers he had heard discussed were Generals Bradley, Ridgway, and Gruenther. I said I had not heard of any others being mentioned. Mr. Pearson thought that any one of these officers would be entirely agreeable to the other nations, but he had made no inquiry.

He asked whether I had any ideas on procedure. I said it seemed to me to be a matter for the Council to originate, since the United States had not previously and was not now pressing any claims or requests. I assumed that in some orderly way the Council would determine that it wished an American officer and would communicate its request to the President. I assumed that the Council would not itself undertake to choose between American officers. I was sure that satisfactory procedures could be worked out, so that the President could ascertain whether his selection met with approval and that then the formal papers could be easily arranged. However, I had not discussed the matter with the President and was only giving a personal view.

Mr. Pearson thought that he might raise this question with the President. However, he did not do so at their meeting on April 14.

COPIES TO: Mr. Perkins
Mr. Matthews
Mr. Bruce
S/S File

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY CRC DATE 7-14-1
TS AUTH.
EXCISIONS A/CDC/MR
RELEASE DENIAL
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

S:D.Acheson:be

TOP SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION
DECLASSIFIED